

**REMARKS**

In this Amendment, Claims 2 and 12 have been amended to recite a thermoformed article having --a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%--. This amendment is supported by the specification at, for example, page 7, lines 16-18, and Claims 6 and 16. Claims 6 and 16 have accordingly been cancelled.

Claims 2 and 12 have also been amended to replace “a surface roughness (Ra) of not more than 3 $\mu$ m” with --a surface roughness (Ra) of not more than 2 $\mu$ m--. This amendment is supported by the specification at, for example, page 6, lines 21-23.

Claim 5 has been amended to add a period at the end.

Claim 18 has been cancelled.

Claims 26 and 27 have been added as new claims. These new claims are supported by the specification at, for example, page 6, lines 21-24, and original Claims 2, 6, 12 and 16.

No new matter has been added and thus, entry of the Amendment is respectfully submitted to be proper. Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17 and 19-27 will be all the claims pending in the application.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is moot, because in this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled Claim 18. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, it was asserted that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation of “the olefin resin.”

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/739,642

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13 and 14 as amended are not indefinite. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 13 and 14 to replace "the olefin resin" with --the crystalline olefin resin--, which is recited in Claim 12, from which Claims 13 and 14 depend.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Yazaki et al (US 4,256,687).

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 3 and 5 as amended are not anticipated by Yazaki et al. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claim 2 to further recite a thermoformed article having --a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%--. Yazaki et al does not disclose or suggest, at least, these aspects of the present invention.

Accordingly, the present invention is not anticipated by Yazaki et al, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 12-15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Tsunashima et al (US 4,410,582).

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5 and 12-15 as amended are not anticipated by Tsunashima et al. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 12 to further recite a thermoformed article having --a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%--. Tsunashima et al does not disclose or suggest, at least, these aspects of the present invention.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/739,642

Accordingly, the present invention is not anticipated by Tsunashima et al, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Nagai et al (US 6,106,933).

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-4 and 12-14 as amended are not anticipated by Nagai et al. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 12 to further recite a thermoformed article having --a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%--. Nagai et al does not disclose or suggest, at least, these aspects of the present invention.

Accordingly, the present invention is not anticipated by Nagai et al, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, 15, 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jacoby et al (US 5,310,584) in view of Fujimori et al (US 4,623,190).

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, 15 and 17 as amended are not *prima facie* obvious over Jacoby et al in view of Fujimori et al. In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 12 to further recite a thermoformed article having --a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%--. Neither Jacoby et al nor Fujimori et al disclose or suggest, at least, these aspects of the present invention.

Accordingly, the present invention is not *prima facie* obvious over Jacoby et al in view of Fujimori et al, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/739,642

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Yazaki et al, as applied to claims 2, 3 and 5 above, and further in view of Osborn et al (US 3,852,237).

In this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled Claim 6, and amended Claim 2 to recite a thermoformed article having --a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%--. Accordingly, Applicants apply the rejection to Claims 2, 3 and 5 as amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2, 3 and 5 as amended are not *prima facie* obvious over Yazaki et al in view of Osborn et al.

The level of transparency successfully achieved by Osborn et al is lower than that achieved by Yazaki et al. Specifically, Yazaki et al discloses, in Example 3-1, a container having a wall haze of 4.8%. On the other hand, the minimum haze achieved by Osborn et al is 13.2% (Example II, Run No. 8). Therefore, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to apply the invention of Osborn et al to the invention of Yazaki et al, for the purpose of improving the transparency of Yazaki et al.

Even if there might be motivation to combine Osborn et al and Yazaki et al, there is no teaching or suggestion that the resulting article would have a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%, as recited in Claim 2.

Accordingly, the present invention is not obvious over Yazaki et al in view of Osborn et al, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/739,642

Claims 6 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tsunashima et al as applied to claims 2-5 and 12-15 above, and further in view of Osborn et al.

In this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled Claims 6 and 16, and amended Claims 2 and 12 to recite a thermoformed article having --a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%--. Accordingly, Applicants apply the rejection to Claims 2-5 and 12-15 as amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5 and 12-15 as amended are not *prima facie* obvious over Tsunashima et al and further in view of Osborn et al.

Neither Tsunashima et al nor Osborn et al teaches or suggests an article having a surface roughness (Ra) of not more than 2 $\mu$ m and a total haze of not more than 4%. Osborn et al is silent about the surface roughness of an article, whereas Tsunashima et al only discloses a surface roughness of a surface layer of 3 to 20  $\mu$ m.

Accordingly, the present invention is not *prima facie* obvious over Tsunashima et al and further in view of Osborn et al, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/739,642

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Fang Liu  
Registration No. 51,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: June 23, 2003

**APPENDIX**  
**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE**

**IN THE CLAIMS:**

**Claims 6, 16 and 18 are canceled.**

**The claims are amended as follows:**

2. (Amended) A thermoformed article comprising a crystalline olefin resin, which article has a surface roughness (Ra) of not more than 3  $\mu$ m, a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%.

3. (Amended) The thermoformed article according to Claim 2, wherein the crystalline olefin resin contains a propylene homopolymer.

4. (Amended) The thermoformed article according to Claim 2, wherein the crystalline olefin resin contains a propylene homopolymer having an mmmm pentad % of not less than 0.95.

5. (Amended) The thermoformed article according to Claim 2, wherein the thermoformed article is a sheet having a thickness of from 50 to 700 $\mu$ m.

12. (Amended) A laminated molding article, which comprises:  
(i) a thermoformed article containing a crystalline olefin resin, and having a surface roughness (Ra) of not more than 3  $\mu$ m, a total haze of not more than 4% and an inner haze of not more than 3%; and

(ii) a substrate containing a crystalline olefin resin.

13. (Amended) The laminated molding article according to Claim 12, wherein the crystalline olefin resin contains a propylene homopolymer.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/739,642

14. (Amended) The laminated molding article according to Claim 12, wherein the crystalline olefin resin contains a propylene homopolymer having an mmmm pentad % of not less than 0.95.

**Claims 26 and 27 are added as new claims.**